

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11 and 20-28. Claims 1, 6, 11, 20, 23 and 26-28 are amended and new claim 29 is added. Claims 3, 8 and 12-19 remain cancelled. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11 and 20-29 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 20-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 07-073011 (Hiromichi).

The Examiner maintains the comparison of the graphics plotter of Hiromichi with the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner points to paragraph 5 (page 3) of Hiromichi as teaching "... rewriting a GUI information of a GUI definition file..." and "replacing a portion of an interface layer of the application in said original operating system... thereby transferring the application from the original operating system environment to the target operating system..." recited in independent claim 20. These portions of Hiromichi specifically state:

"The drawing data registration section and the drawing control-point-setting section perform registration of drawing data, and a setup of drawing control to the virtual graphic interface section, and the drawing data display section draws based on registration of the drawing data of the virtual graphic interface section, and a setup of drawing control. When the drawing environments of hardware and software differ, the drawing data registration section, the drawing control-point-setting section, and the virtual graphic interface section are diverted, and only the drawing data display section is changed. The candidate for drawing is easily transplantable with this."

(paragraph 5, page 3 of Hiromichi).

As can be seen from the above discussion, this portion of Hiromichi does not discuss "rewriting a GUI information of a GUI definition file... including adding GUI information of a menu status displayed using the GUI definition file of said original operating system environment" and "replacing a portion of an interface layer of the application in said original operating system environment", as recited in claim 20. For the above-discussed reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a priori case of anticipation. For this reason it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In particular, Hiromichi discusses drawing environments of a graphics plotter where drawing data is used between plotting environments of a single graphics plotter program. In

conjunction with paragraph 5 (page 3), discussed above, the Examiner refers to paragraph 9 on page 5 as teaching all of the features recited in independent claims 23, 26 and 27. However, paragraph 9 of Hiromichi is directed to registering drawing data and using the registered drawing data (image data, graphical data, alphabetic data) to set a plotting environment for the graphics plotter program.

Independent claims 23 and 26 recite, "GUI information" (Claim 23) and "the graphical user interface files used to display the menu status via the first operating system" (claim 26) that is added is determined based on "a comparison" of the GUI definition file and the target GUI definition file ("comparison of the graphical user interface files of the first operating system and said the definition file created" in claim 26).

Claim 27 recites, "transferring the application from the first operating system with the first platform to the second operating system with the second platform by adding graphical user interface files of the application used to display a menu status in the first operating system to graphical interface files that are lacking from a definition file created for the application in the second operating system."

Hiromichi does not teach or suggest the above-discussed features including "a comparison" between definition and graphical user interface files of an original OS with that of a target OS (see above discussion of claims 20, 23, 26 and 27).

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Hiromichi. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 21 recites that "the portion of the interface layer of the application in said original operating system environment and the portion of the interface layer of the application in said target operating system environment comprise dependent portions that draw images in a window of a display according to an image instruction of the application by using corresponding GUI definition file" (see also claim 24). Hiromichi is limited to plotting environments of a single graphics plotter program, and thus, does not teach or suggest these features of claims 21 and 24.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11 and 12-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: U.S. Patent No. 5,956,029 (Okada) and

"Performance of Windows NT Porting Environments" (Blanton). Claims 12-19 were cancelled in the Amendment filed January 19, 2006.

The Examiner implies that displaying a menu status using the origin GUI definition file is taught by the event acquiring section (110) of Okada that acquires a picture drawing event and transfers the same to the picture information acquiring section (111). However, Okada does not teach or suggest how the screen information from the dialog component is obtained (see, col. 4, lines 43-50). Specifically, Okada does not teach or suggest displaying a menu using "the GUI definition file" as taught by the claimed invention.

The Examiner also compares the claimed feature of creating a target GUI definition file with extracting target point picture information from picture information stored in the picture information storage section (112) via the target point extracting section (113) and using a template based on the extracted screen information in Okada. However, Okada is limited to creating a new screen by changing size and position of a component such as a button and menu (see, col. 5, lines 23-43 and Fig. 3).

At item 7 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Okada does not explicitly teach actually transferring the application from the original operating system environment to the target system environment. Applicants respectfully submit that since Okada is limited to simply converting different operation environments (i.e., color and size) within the same (original) application program (see, col. 1, lines 5-17), there is no motivation to combine Okada with Blanton.

Moreover, Blanton only discusses recompiling the UNIX code in a UNIX like development environment on the Windows NT platform and does not teach or suggest "transferring the application" as taught by the claimed invention.

The disclosed system and method determines a difference between a GUI definition of an original OS and a GUI definition file created for a target OS and adds deficient GUI information to the GUI definition file created for the target OS to transfer the application in the target OS.

Independent claim 1, by way of example recites, "creating a target GUI definition file for the application in said target operating system environment, said original and target operating systems providing different platforms" and "adding GUI information of a menu associated with the status displayed to the target GUI definition file." Claim 1 further recites that the target GUI definition file is used "to display the menu in said target operating system environment" and "said

GUI information added is determined based on a comparison of said origin GUI definition file and said target GUI definition file,” thereby “transferring the application to the target operating system environment.”

Similarly, claim 6 recites that the GUI information is added to the target definition file based on “a comparison of contents of the GUI definition file of the original operating system environment and contents of the target GUI definition file for the application in the target operating system environment.” Claim 11 recites similar features (see also above discussion pertaining to claims 20, 23, 26 and 27).

Claim 28 recites, “generating a file for the second operating system and adding GUI information of a menu of the application displayed in the first operating system having the first platform to the file”, where the GUI information results “from a content difference between a file used to display the menu in the first operating system and the file generated for the second operating system.”

Okada and Blanton, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, the above-discussed features of the claims including adding GUI information determined based on “a comparison” of the origin GUI definition file used to display the menu to the target definition file created for transferring the application to the target operating system environment as recited in each of the independent claims (“graphical interface files that are lacking from a definition file created” in claim 27).

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Okada and Blanton.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Okada and Blanton. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 4, displaying of the menu status comprises “sequentially searching from a parent window to a sub-window of said menu and fetching a position and a size of each window in said displayed status”, where creating the target GUI definition file includes “outputting said fetched position and size of each window and creating the target GUI definition file” (see also claim 9 reciting similar features).

Okada and Blanton, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-discussed features of claims 4 and 9 including displaying the menu status by “sequentially searching from a parent window to a sub-window of said menu and fetching a position and a size of each window in said displayed status.”

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 29 has been added to recite, "adding GUI information necessary to display a menu to a definition file created for a second operating system by determining a difference between a definition file used to display the menu using a first operating system and said definition file created." New claim 29 further recites, "transferring an application of the first operating system to the second operating system and subsequently using the definition file having said added GUI information to display the menu using the second operating system."

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above discussed features including "determining a difference between a definition file used to display the menu using a first operating system and said definition file created" and "transferring an application of the first operating system to the second operating system and subsequently using the definition file...", as recited in claim 29.

It is submitted that new claim 29 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 09/18/2006

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501